

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 6, 14, 18 and 20 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

Specification

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for subject matter in claims 18 and 19. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 18 has been amended to recite “an expansion connector coupled to the processor, the expansion connector configured to couple to input/output devices.” Applicants also submit that Figure 3 has been corrected showing element 310 which is the handheld computer and optional expansion module 345 shown in dashed lines. Optional expansion module 345 inherently connects to an expansion connector which receives an input/output device since here the expansion module is disclosed as having an RF transceiver which is an input/output device. Accordingly, as dependent claim 18 has been amended, applicants submit that claims 18 and 19 have antecedent basis found in Figure 3 and further in paragraph [0027]. Accordingly, applicants request that the objections to claims 18 and 19 be withdrawn.

Drawings

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to show expansion module 345. Applicants have corrected a drawing error which showed reference numeral 310 pointing to the expansion module instead of the handheld computer as disclosed in the application. The reference numeral 345 pointing to the expansion module shown in dashed lines has been added.

Claim Objections

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 6 because of an informality. Applicants have amended claim 6 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 6 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

In Section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Soini et al. In the rejection, the Examiner indicates that "Miller differs from claim 1 of the present invention in that it does not explicitly disclose the transceiver configured to send and receive data while the battery charge is below the low level." Applicants have amended claims 1 and 14 to more specifically clarify the invention by adding the phrase "the battery unable to power the transceiver when the charge is] below the low level and no charge is being provided to the battery." What is taught in Soini et al. is not an RF transceiver that can send and receive messages when the battery has been discharged below a level and in which the transceiver can be used while the battery is charging. What is disclosed in Soini et al. is that the user is provided a warning that the battery is approaching a level at which the transceiver will no longer be able to be used until the battery can be recharged. In fact, what Soini teaches is that if the voltage of the battery drops below a preset limit a warning is provided to a user. If the voltage then drops further below another preset limit, power is cut off to the transmission means, and radio functions may not be used "until the battery has

been recharged.” See paragraph [0040], lines 15-16. Soini et al. also teaches that “if the voltage over battery 46 drops further below preset limit value PowerOff 35, multi-service mobile station 1 cuts off power from even the section of multi-service mobile station 1 offering data traffic services and remains waiting for battery change or recharging.” Paragraph [0042]. This teaching of Soini et al. does not provide any motivation to combine the teachings of Soini et al. and Miller to arrive at applicants’ invention as Soini et al. teaches that the battery must be recharged before continuing to use the radio means or the battery must be changed before continuing to use the radio. Applicants claim that the radio function may be used if the battery has reached a charge level which is below a charge level at which the transceiver can be used, as long as the battery is connected to a power source such as in the recharging cradle, for example. This limitation is not taught in any combination of Miller and Soini et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 14, as amended, are therefore allowable.

In Section 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janik et al. in view of Soini et al. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Janik et al. in view of Soini et al. does not provide all the claim limitations recited in amended independent claim 20. Similar to claims 1 and 14 in which the Examiner relies on the teachings of Soini et al. for the disclosure of applicants’ invention, Soini et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the transceiver is configured to send and receive data while the battery charge is below the low level and the module receives power from a power source and provides power to the rechargeable battery and to the transceiver and the battery is unable to power the transceiver when the charge is below the low level and no charge is being provided to the battery. Soini et al. only discloses that a warning is provided to a user and if the battery is allowed to run below the low level the battery must be recharged or changed not that the device should be connected to a power source and the transceiver would still work after the device was connected to a charging device. Accordingly, independent claim 20 as amended is allowable.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance.
Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 12, 2004

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5730
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,603